

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
North Carolina

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in North Carolina. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 15 Dec 05. Out of the responses received, in North Carolina, 3408 of a possible 4505 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .756, for a rating of 75.6%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q1, “Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	3.086419753	Mean	3.789473684	Mean	4.346153846	Mean	4.430379747	Mean	4.106060606
Standard Error	0.140762398	Standard Error	0.109729795	Standard Error	0.109226267	Standard Error	0.09815491	Standard Error	0.120466823
Median	3	Median	4	Median	5	Median	5	Median	4
Mode	3	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	5
Standard Deviation	1.266861583	Standard Deviation	0.956602174	Standard Deviation	0.964660267	Standard Deviation	0.872419922	Standard Deviation	0.978677096
Sample Variance	1.604938272	Sample Variance	0.915087719	Sample Variance	0.930569431	Sample Variance	0.761116521	Sample Variance	0.957808858
Kurtosis	-0.960503575	Kurtosis	0.594016672	Kurtosis	3.923773137	Kurtosis	2.797815385	Kurtosis	1.596215719
Skewness	-0.014749434	Skewness	-0.781294997	Skewness	-1.910116799	Skewness	-1.682762132	Skewness	-1.233639282
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	250	Sum	288	Sum	339	Sum	350	Sum	271
Count	81	Count	76	Count	78	Count	79	Count	66
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	3.698630137	Mean	3.85	Mean	3.913043478	Mean	7.802469136	Mean	6.512820513
Standard Error	0.133283283	Standard Error	0.125380776	Standard Error	0.128502309	Standard Error	0.194380746	Standard Error	0.264281451
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	8	Median	6
Mode	4	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	8	Mode	6
Standard Deviation	1.138772872	Standard Deviation	0.971195315	Standard Deviation	1.067420343	Standard Deviation	1.749426714	Standard Deviation	2.334070575
Sample Variance	1.296803653	Sample Variance	0.943220339	Sample Variance	1.139386189	Sample Variance	3.060493827	Sample Variance	5.447885448
Kurtosis	-0.107810129	Kurtosis	1.734422408	Kurtosis	0.03429443	Kurtosis	-0.570490647	Kurtosis	-0.953388032
Skewness	-0.769579463	Skewness	-1.067174231	Skewness	-0.793762985	Skewness	-0.378897867	Skewness	-0.016650069
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	6	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	4	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	270	Sum	231	Sum	270	Sum	632	Sum	508
Count	73	Count	60	Count	69	Count	81	Count	78

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

